UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,948	03/02/2005	Kenji Mori	MUR-040-USA-PCT	8463
27955 TOWNSEND &	7590 04/22/200 & BANTA	9	EXAMINER	
c/o PORTFOLI	O IP		SO, ELIZABETH K	
PO BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3766	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Intervious Company	10/501,948	MORI ET AL.	
Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ELIZABETH SO	3766	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
(1) <u>ELIZABETH SO</u> .	(3) <u>DON TOWNSEND</u> .		
(2) <u>CARL LAYNO</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>21 April 2009</u> .			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	2)∏ applicant's representative	e]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>2</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: Higo et al (US 6,259,94	<u>46 B1)</u> .		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: Discussed the applicant's Higo reference. If the applicant modifies claim 2 to add new examiner recommends that the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant's device from the comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation comparative tests that distinguish the applicant files a Continuation files a	s proposed amended claim 2, w matter that is not supported in the inclusion in the inclusion in the art. In the art will be amendments that will be a supported in the amendments in the amendments that will be a supported in the amendment in t	which does not oby the specification under detailed data reed would render the sould render the been filed, APP ODAYS FROM TWHICHEVER IS	er the claims claims OF THE LICANT IS CHIS LATER, TO
/E. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3766	/Carl H. Layno/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art U	nit 3766	

Application No.

Applicant(s)